1 **REMARKS**

2 This amendment is in support of the RCE submitted on January 30, 2007. A marked up copy of
3 that RCE is submitted herewith.

4 These remarks follow the order of the paragraphs of the office action. Relevant portions of the
5 advisory office action are shown indented and italicized. Claims 1-20 are presented for
6 application. Claims 1, 6-8 and 12 are amended to bring this application to allowance quickly.

7 The ADVISORY ACTION states:

8 *Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:*
9 *it is noted that, Claim 20 (New) of the amendment filed 12-21-2006 were not properly*
10 *labeled. This claim has been treated as it the status identifier of "previously presented"*
11 *had been included. If this is not correct, applicants should notify the USPTO with*
12 *corrected amendment. Any future correspondence must contain the proper status*
13 *identifiers." (MPEP 37 CFR 1.121).*

14 In response, the applicants respectfully state that continued exception is taken with the so called
15 equivalency of Orr and the elements in the presently claimed invention. However, claims are
16 amended to bring this application to allowance quickly.

17 *In addition, applicants arguments filed 12-21-2000 have been fully considered but they*
18 *are not persuasive.*

19 In response, the applicants respectfully state that continued exception is taken with the so called
20 equivalency of Orr and the elements in claims *1-20.*

21 *Regarding claims 1-20. Applicant argues against the use of the Orr reference.*
22 *Specifically argues against the obviousness statement in relying on Orr for claims 1-20*
23 *(page 8, bottom - page 9, top) and Orr is not concerned with digest screen display*
24 *content deciding means to select display elements belonging to respective regions of a*
25 *document based on display priorities of the display elements (Remarks, page 10, bottom),*
26 *Applicant argues that here is no inventive commonality between art and claims 1-20*
27 *(Remarks, pages 13-14). The examiner disagrees First, the examiner characterizes the*
28 *applicants invention as a means for creating a digest, in which a document, the layout of*
29 *which is predetermined by a creator, is transformed to make certain that the transformed*

1   *document is fitted within a display area required by a reader, where the layout of the*
2   *document (which can be a web page) is predetermined by the creator and then is*
3   *transformed to fit within the display area by the reader, where the display content of the*
4   *digest screen be changed in response to the operation of the user, a browsing*
5   *environment capable of sensitively coping with a user's wish (see Applicant's*
6   *specification. pages 5-6, summary of the invention section). Accordingly, the Orr*
7   *reference discloses the applicant's invention. Orr discloses a design engine for automatic*
8   *reformatting for design and media that will automatically fit content to the selected*
9   *design (ie., a newsletter) represented in the selected media (ie., printed page, screen,*
10   *HTML, etc) and position text and graphics, change type specifications, jump stories and*
11   *make other needed adjustments to the layout to make it automatically fit to make the*
12   *design look good (col 5, lines 57- col 6, line 8). Orr's disclosure reformats a page to fit*
13   *into various media, while maintaining all of the substantive layout out of the components.*
14   *This disclosure is functionally equivalent to the desired goals of the current application*
15   *(as characterized by examiner above).*

16   In response, the applicant respectfully states that applicant takes continued exception with the

17   alleged equivalencies of elements in claims 1-20, are apparently not made obvious by Orr.

18   Applicants respectfully state that in reviewing the office communication it is apparent that

19   although the Examiner rejects all the claims, the statements of the office communication actually

20   can be deemed to support the novelty of the present invention as claimed over Orr, the cited

21   reference.

22   The rejections are apparently based primarily on statements, indicating that although Orr doesn't

23   do (or allude to) the particular claim element, "it would be obvious" to do the particular claim

24   element. Sometimes the clear words of the claim element are redefined in the office

25   communication and construed such as to allegedly put it into a part of Orr and subsequently

26   support a rejection.

27   Applicants believe that the "it is obvious" is a result of possible hindsight in an effort to form

28   elements of the claims of the present invention that have no preexistence. In some claims, it is

29   these elements that make the novelty. The Examiner is asked to support the "it is obvious"

30   statements and the new way each claim is characterized and construed.

1 In general, the present invention, claimed in Claims 1-19, provides:

2   Digest screen display content deciding means selects display elements belonging to

3   respective regions of a document based on display priorities of the display elements, which

4   are obtained by digest screen display priority information creating means, and decides

5   selected display elements as display content of a digest screen under a condition where a

6   total display area does not exceed a required display area. A merging relationship among

7   the regions is set based on layout information for the regions, created by digest screen

8   region layout information creating means. Display content deciding means decides the

9   display content of a detail screen based on the merging relationship among the regions,

10   and creates a digest of the detail screen based on control information created by control

11   information creating means. Moreover, digest screen display content changing means

12   changes the display content of the digest screen in response to an operation of a user.

13 The cited art to Orr , US Patent 5895476, filed: September 9, 1996, is entitled: "Design engine

14 for automatic reformatting for design and me". The abstract of Orr reads:

15   "A three-way separation of information in a document includes content, design and media

16   aspects. This division supports automatic rendering to multiple forms of media such as

17   print, Intranet, Internet, and OLE embedding. A method changes the design of a

18   composition having a current design that is rendered in a particular medium. The

19   composition is represented by components in a current design tree and includes content

20   elements associated with the components. A new design tree is created for the

21   composition based upon a new design and new design components. Next, each of the

22   content elements are linked into an association with one of the new design components

23   such that the set of relationships between the content elements in the context of the new

24   design are maintained. Media layout values are calculated for each content element of the

25   composition. The content elements are laid out in the new design and the new design

26   retains the composition rendered in the particular medium. Another method changes the

27   medium of a composition having a current design. A new media tree is created for the

28   composition that is representative of a new medium and includes media tree components.

29   Next, each of the content elements is associated with one of the media tree components

1   such that each of the content elements is associated with a region of the new medium.

2   Media layout values are calculated for each content element of the composition such that

3   each of the media layout values for each content element defines one of the regions of the

4   new medium."

5   Thus, Orr is concerned with "automatic rendering to multiple forms of media such as print,

6   Intranet, Internet, and OLE embedding." Orr is not concerned with and does not allude to,

7   "[D]igest screen display content deciding means" to select "display elements belonging to

8   respective regions of a document based on display priorities of the display elements," as in claims

9   1-19. Orr is directed to "A three-way separation of information in a document includes content,

10   design and media aspects." "This division supports automatic rendering to multiple forms of

11   media such as print, Intranet, Internet, and OLE embedding." This has little or no relationship to

12   and doesn't make obvious the invention novelties of claims 1-20. A review of the cited portions

13   of Orr reveals that besides using some words and/or phrases that may be common with words

14   and/or phrases of Claims 1-20, this entire and/or cited portions of Orr do not allude to and are

15   not useful for backup or justification for making the invention in Claims 1, 6, 8 and 12 obvious.

16   Thus claims 1-20 are allowable over the cited art.

17   The Advisory action states further:

18   *Applicant argues that Applicant, regarding claims 1, 6, 8 and 12, that indeed the*
19   *applicants specification, pages 5-6, summary of the invention section includes means for*
20   *creating a digest, in which a document the layout of which is predetermined by a creator,*
21   *is transformed to make certain that the transformed document is fitted within a display*
22   *area required by reader, where the layout of the document (which can be a web page) is*
23   *predetermined by the creator and then is transformed to fit within the display area by the*
24   *reader, where the display content of the digest screen be changed in response to the*
25   *operation of the user, a browsing environment capable of sensitively coping with a users*
26   *wish. However, that does not construe or limit the claims as indicated above. The manner*
27   *that this is construed is apparently in order to support citing the referenced art (Remarks,*
28   *page 11, top). The examiner disagrees.*

29   *Regarding claims 1,6, 8 and 12, Orr suggests means for selecting the display elements*
30   *based, exceed a required display area. The examiner characterizes the applicants*
31   *invention as a means for creating a digest, in which a document the layout of which is*
32   *predetermined by a creator, is transformed to make certain that the transformed*

document is fitted within a display area required by a reader, where the layout of the document (which can be a web page) is predetermined by the creator and then is transformed to fit within the display area by the reader, where the display content of the digest screen be changed in response to the operation of the user, a browsing environment capable of sensitively coping with a users wish (see Applicants specification, pages 5-6, summary of the invention section).

Furthermore, Applicant argues that Orr's teaching of the placement of overlap is not related to merging relationship among regions as in the claims (Remarks, page 12, top). The examiner disagrees. Orr's overlapping disclosure is similar to the instant application's functionality of the "means" of merging regions, Orr describes a media tree with tend areas and image areas, which are the media regions as components of the page (col 28, Line 40 - col 29, line 15) where the child component is placed in a location that overlaps the region occupied by the parent component (col 30, line 59 - col 31, line 4). The examiner characterizes Orr's media divisions as regions. which are automatically adjusted or reformatted to fit the content to the media (col 32, lines 40-44). This disclosure is equivalent to the description of regions in the applicant's specification.

Additionally, Applicant claims the means for selecting and means for setting a merging relationship (Remarks. page 12, bottom through page 13. bottom). Orr teaches these means, like automatically adjusted or reformatted to fit the content to the media (col 32, lines 40-44) provides the automatic means for selecting and deciding how to adjust the content to a particular media and performing the necessary changes and reformatting to the layout of the content to make it fit. For the means for merging. Orr describes a media tree with text areas and image areas, which are the media regions as components of the page (col 28, line 40 - col 29, line 15) where the child component is pieced in a location that overlaps the region occupied by the parent component (col 30, line 59 - col 31, line 4). The tree provides a relationship that allows for future overlap or manipulation of child and parent components in order to fit content according to a layout option. This disclosure is equivalent to the description of regions in the applicant's specification.

Also, Applicant argues that Orr does not do the functions of the means for selecting and/or setting and/or deciding or claims 1-20 (page 14, bottom and page 16, top). The examiner disagrees, the applicant claims the means for selecting and means for setting a merging relationship (see claim 1). Orr teaches these means, like automatically adjusted or reformatted to fit the content to the media (col 32, lines 40-44) provides the automatic means for selecting and deciding how to adjust the content to a particular media and performing the necessary changes and reformatting to the layout of the content to make it fit. For the means for merging. Orr describes a media tree with text areas and image areas, which are the media regions as components of the page (col 28, line 40- col 29, line 15) where the child component is placed in a location that overlaps the region occupied by the parent component (col 30. line 59- col 31, line 4). The tree provides a relationship that allows for future overlap or manipulation of child and parent components in order to fit content according to a layout option. This disclosure is equivalent to the description of regions in the applicant's specification.

1   In response, the applicant respectfully states that for the sake of completeness, applicant indicates

2   that the previously made arguments still stand and are repeated as follows. Indeed Orr does not

3   teach merging relationship among regions as in the claims. The alleged equivalence of what Orr

4   does teach, to merging relationship among regions in the present invention is not supported by the

5   example above. Orr's overlapping disclosure is indeed not similar to the instant application's

6   functionality of the means of merging regions.

7   Continued exception is taken with the so called equivalency of Orr and the elements in claims 1,

8   6, 8 and 12. For example, claim 1 as presently amended reads:

9   1. An information processing apparatus comprising means for creating a digest of a

10   document a layout of which is determined, when said layout being too large to fit in a

11   display screen of a display device or when a document reader requires said document to be

12   zoomed for reading characters displayed on the display device, the document including a

13   plurality of regions, each region including one or more display elements, the means for

14   creating comprising:

15   means for selecting the display elements based on display priorities of the display

16   elements, and for deciding all of selected display elements as a display content of a digest

17   screen under a condition where a total display area of all of the selected display elements

18   does not exceed a required display area; and

19   means for setting a merging relationship among the regions by deciding a merging

20   region, with which a region not being displayed on the digest screen is merged, from

21   among regions displayed on the digest screen based on layout information for the regions

22   in the document, all of the regions being included in the document; and

23   means for ensuring access to information lost by creating the digest and ensuring

24   said digest fits optimally on said display device.

25   The cited art uses a different way to solve a different problem, and is not concerned with a:

1   layout being too large to fit in a display screen of a display device or when a document

2   reader requires said document to be zoomed for reading characters displayed on the

3   display device

4 Orr is not concerned with and doesn't allude to:

5   ensuring access to information lost by creating the digest and ensuring said digest fits

6   optimally on said display device

7 And as stated previously, the 'means for selecting' and the 'means for setting a merging

8 relationship' elements of Claims 1, 6, 8 and 12 are "for creating a digest of a document a layout of

9 which is determined, the document including a plurality of regions, each region including one or

10 more display elements." Any alleged so called equivalencies with the 'means for selecting' or

11 'setting' etc., in Orr, are for a method that "changes the design of a composition having a current

12 design that is rendered in a particular medium." For example, the cited portion of Orr (col. 39,

13 lines 35-67) reads.

14   FIG. 33 now describes the fit content to media step 520 of FIG. 29. At this point in FIG.

15   29, new content has been added to the composition. But because most media is limited in

16   some sense (i.e., paper media may be limited to a certain number of pages), it may be

17   necessary to either readjust the content, the design or the media of the composition in

18   order to make the information fit within the media. The information may be adjusted to fit

19   within the desired media in a wide variety of manners. By way of example, the design may

20   be readjusted to allow the content to fit within the available media. Alternatively, the

21   media may be adjusted, i.e. the media may be lengthened, in order to allow the content to

22   fit within the media. That is, the number of pages in a document may be changed, or the

23   calculation of the media divisions may dictate a different layout. Also, the content itself

24   may be adjusted in some fashion to fit within a defined media region. For example, a filler

25   image may be clipped from a larger stock image in order to make everything fit within a

26   page. It should be appreciated that any one these techniques may be used by itself, or in

27   conjunction with the other techniques. Step 520 describes a method for fitting the

28   information of a composition into a media region by adjusting the content and design.

29

1   Once new content has been added to a composition, there may be a variety of reasons why
2   the overall content of the composition must be adjusted in order to fit it within the
3   available media. For example, if a page of text is nearly full and a picture is dropped onto
4   this page, the design tree will be changed because a new component is created for the
5   picture. In this situation, not only are the design tree and the content tree changed, but
6   also the media tree will have new regions calculated for the newly dropped picture. In
7   another"

8   Besides using some words and/or phrases that may be common with to Claims 1, 6, 8 and 12,
9   this entire portion of Orr does not allude to and is not useful for making the invention in Claims 1,
10   6, 8 and 12 obvious. The office communications statement below actually shows the opposite to
11   'obviousness' or he lack of equivalency with Orr and claim 1. Actually, there is no inventive
12   commonality between Orr and claims 1-20

13   Thus exception is taken with the office communication statement:

14   *For example, Orr discloses a design for automatic reformatting for design and media,*
15   *which fits content to media, where new content is added to the composition, content is*
16   *readjusted in order to make the information fit within the desired media (col. 39, lines*
17   *35-67) based on a priority from the priority list (col. 35, lines 21-25). Orr does not*
18   *expressly teach means for setting a merging relationship among regions ... included in*
19   *the document, but with Orr's teachings, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary*
20   *skill in the art. For example, Orr discloses components being placed in a location that*
21   *overlaps within the region occupied by the parent component, yet in a different*
22   *orientation (col. 30, line 60 - col.*
23   *31, line 5).*

24   Claims 6 and 7 are amended to be detailed system claims. This is a picture of the novel system of
25   the present invention. Claim 6 now reads:

26   6. An information processing system for creating a digest of a document a layout of which
27   is determined, the system comprising:

28   a proxy server including:
29   digest screen display priority information creating means, for executing program
30   code recorded in a storage device, for obtaining display priorities of display elements
31   based on attributes of display elements belonging to each region of an inputted Web page

formed of a plurality of regions, for preparing information concerning display priorities, and for dividing an HTML document of the inputted Web page into said regions of semantic clusters, and for imparting a significance forming a display priority for each of the regions, and

a digest screen region layout information creating means 42 for executing program code recorded in the storage device to create layout information for the regions, utilized when setting a merging relationship between a display area and a non-display area on a digest screen in accordance with a predetermined rule for ensuring access to the non-display area by a user;

information processing apparatus including digest screen display content deciding means for executing program code recorded in the storage device to select display elements based on the display priorities of the display elements, and to decide all selected display elements as display content of applicants respectfully state digest screen under a condition where a total display area of all of the selected display elements does not exceed a required display area, comprising digest screen display content changing means 48 to change display content of the digest screen based on operations of the user;

digest screen region merging relationship setting means for executing program code recorded in the storage device to decide, after the display content of the digest screen is determined, a merging region, with which any region that is not displayed on the digest screen at all is merged, from among the regions displayed on the digest screen, and utilize layout information for the regions, created by the digest screen region layout information creating means ;

detail screen display content deciding means for executing program code recorded in the storage device to decide, as a display content of the detail screen, a region group formed of regions displayed on the digest screen and merged regions merged with the displayed regions in response to that a detail display of the displayed regions is required, and

referring to the merging relationship among the regions set by the digest screen region merging relationship setting means , and when the regions cannot be fitted within an acceptable display area selects display elements based on the display priorities obtained by detail screen display priority information creating means , thus creating the digest of the detail screen and setting the merging relationship among the regions on the detail screen by employing detail screen region layout information creating means and detail screen region merging relationship setting means ; and

control information creating means comprising:

        detail screen display priority information creating means for executing program code recorded in the storage device performing the function of said digest screen display priority information creating means for different target display elements,

        detail screen region layout information creating means for executing program code recorded in the storage device performing function of the digest screen region layout information creating means for said different target display elements,

        detail screen region merging relationship setting means for executing program code recorded in the storage device performing functions of the digest screen region merging relationship setting means for said different target display elements.

Claim 7 now reads:

    7. The <u>system</u> according to claim 6,

wherein the operation of the user comprises operations performed directly for the digest screen and performed indirectly for the detail screen,

wherein changes of the digest screen consist of any combinations of changes taken from a group of changes consisting of:

        enlargement of a specific region,

1   reduction of a specific region,

2   deletion of a specific region,

3   display of a specific invisible region, and

4   selection of a specific region;

5   wherein said display area is a display area required directly by a user or indirectly by the

6   information processing apparatus;

7   wherein a particular region having low priority is not displayed on the digest screen, and

8   further comprises merging said particular region with another display region in accordance

9   with a predetermined rule for the purpose of ensuring accesses to the particular region by

10   the user.

11   wherein regions displayed on the digest screen include display elements displayed on the

12   digest screen referred to as "visible regions," and regions not displayed on the digest

13   screen referred to as "invisible regions"; and

14   wherein merging relationship of invisible regions merged with the other regions are

15   referred to as "merged regions," and merging relationship of visible regions that merge the

16   merged regions are referred to as "merging regions".

17   Thus claims 6 and 7 are certainly novel of Orr. Orr doesn't allude to or make obvious any of the

18   elements detailed. The detailed elements are for the embodiment of Fig. 2, which is novel and

19   non-obvious to Orr.

20   Also, the placement of overlap is not related to the regions in claims 1-20. Applicant takes

21   particular continued exception with the statement in the office communication:

22   *It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention*
23   *to interpret Orr to include placing components in a location that overlaps within the*
24   *region occupied by the parent, yet in a different orientations as equivalent as taught by*
25   *Orr to a merging relationship, providing the benefit of having the user author a*
26   *document once and then having a system to adapt the document automatically for*

1   *changes in the design or output media while maintaining the relationships between*

2   *content elements of the document (col. 2, lines 43-47).*

3   Review of this portion reveals that Orr is not related to the present claimed invention. Orr's

4   *"design for automatic reformatting for design and media, which fits content to media, where new*

5   *content is added to the composition, content is readjusted in order to make the information fit*

6   *within the desired media (col. 39, lines 35-67) based on a priority from the priority list,"* does

7   not do the functions of the means for selecting and/or 'setting' of Claims 1-20. The alleged

8   obviousness statement is relying Orr which is not related to the elements in Claims 1, 6, 8 and 12.

9   Indeed it would not be obvious to use Orr as a backdrop to make Claims 1, 6, 8 and 12 obvious.

10   Furthermore, applicant takes exception with and requests backup for statement of the alleged

11   obviousness. Thus Claims 1, 6, 8 and 12 are not made obvious by the augmentation with Orr, and

12   are allowable.

13   The cited portions of Orr do not allude or make obvious,

14   means for selecting the display elements based on display priorities of the display elements,

15   means for deciding all of selected display elements as a display content of a digest screen under

16   a condition where a total display area of all of the selected display elements does not exceed a

17   required display area;

18   any relationship

19   any merging relationship,

20   any means for setting a merging relationship among the regions

21   means for deciding a merging region,

22   means for which a region not being displayed on the digest screen is merged,

23   means for merging regions from among regions displayed on the digest screen based on layout

24   information for the regions in the document, all of the regions being included in the document.

25   Thus Orr does not make Claims 1, 6, 8 and 12 obvious and all are allowable, as are all claims that

26   depend upon these allowable claims

27   *In addition, Applicant argues against the obviousness statement in relying on Orr for*

28   *claims 2, 9 and 13 because the applicant argues that Orr is not related to the present*

29   *claimed invention (Remarks. page 15). The examiner disagrees. Orr reference discloses*

30   *the applicant's invention. Orr discloses a design engine for automatic reformatting for*

31   *design and media that will automatically fit content to the selected design (ie., a*

1	*newsletter) represented in the selected media (ie., printed page, screen, HTML, etc) and*
2	*position text and graphics, change type specifications, jump stories and make other*
3	*needed adjustments to the layout to make it automatically fit to make the design look*
4	*good (col 5, lines 57 - col 6, line 8). This disclosure is functionally equivalent to the*
5	*desired goals of the current application (as characterized by examiner above).*
6	*In addition, Applicant argues that Orr does not teach elements in claims 3-5, 7, 10-11,*
7	*and 14-19, particularly the 'means for creating' (Remarks, page 16, bottom). The*
8	*examiner disagrees. Specifically, Orr teaches a user authors a document, thereafter the*
9	*document reformatting is automatic, upon initiation by the author (col 2, lines 43-47). in*
10	*addition, Orr discloses a user authors a document, thereafter the document reformatting*
11	*is automatic, upon initiation by the author (col 2, Lines 43-47). Also, On discloses*
12	*performing calculations on the displayed elements and whitespace. in order to provide an*
13	*interface that is optimally fit for the display region while maintaining referential*
14	*integrity. Although Orr does not use the express language of the claim such as 'arrayed*
15	*display elements', Orr does suggest the conceptual quest or the claim language when*
16	*viewed with the broadest reasonable interpretation under the specification.*
17	*For example, based on the fixed properties, the image will adjust itself in order to fit in*
18	*a particular region and will keep its aspect ratio and will automatically adjust its height*
19	*in order to fit the region taking in consideration a user specification (col 43, lines 4-14).*
20	*Additionally, Orr does expressly disclose content scale factors for scaling content either*
21	*up or down in order to assist in fitting all of the content into the available media,*
22	*including a white space scale factor (col 40. lines 26-48). Furthermore. Orr discloses*
23	*processing of data by a computer system to automatic formatting of information for a*
24	*change in design or a medium with persistent storage (col 1, lines 5-9; col 9, lines 58-*
25	*65).*
26	Claim 12 is amended, and now reads:
27	12. (currently amended) A program comprising code for creating a digest of a document a
28	layout of which is determined, <u>when said layout being too large to fit in a display screen of</u>
29	<u>a display device or when a document reader requires said document to be zoomed for</u>
30	<u>reading characters displayed on the display device,</u> the document including a plurality of
31	regions, each region including one or more display elements, the program allowing a
32	computer to realize:
33	a function to select the display elements based on display priorities of the display
34	elements, and to decide all of selected display elements as a display content of a digest
35	screen under a condition where a total display area of all of the selected display elements
36	does not exceed a required display area; and
37	a function to set a merging relationship among the regions by deciding a merging
38	region, with which a region not being displayed on the digest screen is merged, from

1   among regions displayed on the digest screen based on layout information for the regions

2   in the document, all of the regions being included in the document; and

3   a function to ensure access to information lost by creating the digest and ensuring

4   said digest fits optimally on said display device.

5   The cited art uses a different way to solve a different problem, and is not concerned with a:

6   layout being too large to fit in a display screen of a display device or when a document

7   reader requires said document to be zoomed for reading characters displayed on the

8   display device

9   Orr is not concerned with and doesn't allude to:

10   ensuring access to information lost by creating the digest and ensuring said digest fits

11   optimally on said display device

12   And as stated previously, Orr doesn't make the other elements of claim 12 obvious. Thus claim

13   12, and all claims that depend thereupon is allowable over the cited art.

14   ***Regarding claims 2, 9, 13 and 20,*** *Orr suggests means for deciding ... displayed regions*

15   *is required For example, when a child component is being placed at a distance from the*

16   *region occupied by the parent components, a decision has to be made such as left-hand*

17   *side or a right-hand side of the region to display the component (col. 30. line 60 - col.*

18   *31, line 4.*

19   In response, the applicants respectfully state that continued exception is taken with the so called

20   equivalency of Orr and the elements in claims 2, 9 and 13.

21   Review of this portion reveals that Orr is not related to the present claimed invention. Orr's

22   *"when a child component is being placed at a distance from the region occupied by the parent*

23   *components, a decision has to be made such as left- hand side or a right-hand side of the region*

24   *to display the component (col. 30, line 60 - col. 31, line 4),"* *bears no relationship to the*

25   *elements in* claims 2, 9 and 13. Orr *(col. 30, line 60 - col. 31, line 4),* reads:

26   FIG. 25d is an example of a child component 414 being placed in a location that overlaps

27   with the region occupied by the parent component 416. FIG. 25e is an example of a child

28   component 418 placed within the region occupied by the parent component 420 yet in a

1   different orientation to that of the parent. FIG. 25f is an example of a child component 422
2   being placed at a distance from the region occupied by the parent component 424. A child
3   component may also coincide completely with the region occupied by the parent
4   component, or may occupy any portion of the region of the parent component, such as a
5   left-hand side or a right-hand side"

6   This has little or no relationship to "means for deciding, as a display content of a detail screen, a

7   region group including the regions displayed on the digest screen and the region merged with the

8   displayed regions in response to that a detail display of the displayed regions is required," as in

9   claim 2. Orr does not do the functions of the means for selecting and/or 'setting' and/or

10   'deciding' etc., of Claims 1-20. The alleged obviousness statement is relying Orr which is not

11   related to the elements in claims 2, 9, 13 and 20. Indeed it would not be obvious to use Orr as a

12   basis to make claims 2, 9, 13 and 20 obvious. Thus claims 2, 9, 13 and 20 are allowable each for

13   itself and because each depends on an allowable claim.

14   The previous action stated further:

15   *Regarding 3,10 and 14, Orr suggests means for creating control ... required display*
16   *area. For example, most media is limited and adjustment may be needed to make the*
17   *media fit 'within' the media (col. 39, lines 35-45) The concept of 'within suggest that*
18   *more content of media exists that there is space allocated for it, which is equivalent to the*
19   *claim language 'too large to fit in the required display area'.*

20   In response, the applicants respectfully state that continued exception is taken with the so called

21   equivalency of Orr and the elements in claims 3, 10 and 14. For example, claim 3 reads:

22   3. (Original) The information processing apparatus according to claim 2, further

23   comprising means for creating control information for controlling a display of the detail

24   screen, wherein the means for deciding the display content of the detail screen creates a

25   digest of the detail screen based on the control information when the region group is too

26   large to fit in the required display area.

27   The so called suggestion by Orr of 'means for creating' is in fact apparently not so. Orr (col. 39,

28   lines 35-45) reads:

29   FIG. 33 now describes the fit content to media step 520 of FIG. 29. At this point in FIG.
30   29, new content has been added to the composition. But because most media is limited in
31   some sense (i.e., paper media may be limited to a certain number of pages), it may be

1   necessary to either readjust the content, the design or the media of the composition in
2   order to make the information fit within the media. The information may be adjusted to fit
3   within the desired media in a wide variety of manners. By way of example, the design may
4   be readjusted to allow the content to fit within the available media.
5   This has no relation to "means for creating control information for controlling a display of the
6   detail screen, wherein the means for deciding the display content of the detail screen creates a
7   digest of the detail screen based on the control information when the region group is too large to
8   fit in the required display area," in claim 3. Thus claims 3, 10 and 14 are allowable over Orr.

9   The previous action stated further:

10   *Regarding claims 4,11 and 15, Orr teaches means for deciding the display operation of*
11   *a user. For example, a user authors a document, thereafter the document reformatting is*
12   *automatic, upon initiation by the author (col. 2, lines 43-47).*

13   In response, the applicants respectfully state that continued exception is taken with the so called
14   equivalency of Orr and the elements in claims 4, 11 and 15. A review of the cited portion of Orr
15   has little or no relationship to the claimed invention. Thus claims 4, 11 and 15 are allowable over
16   Orr.

17   The previous action stated further:

18   *Regarding claim 5, On suggests changing means ... operation of a user. For example, a*
19   *user authors a document, thereafter the document reformatting is automatic upon*
20   *initiation by the author (col. 2, lines 43-47).*

21   In response, the applicants respectfully state that continued exception is taken with the so called
22   equivalency of Orr and the elements in claim 5. A review of the cited portion of Orr has little or
23   no relationship to the claimed invention. Thus claim 5 is allowable over Orr.

24   The previous action stated further:
25
26   *Regarding claim 7, Orr suggests means for arraying .. predetermined criterion; means*
27   *for obtaining a ratio ... length of the region; and means for dividing... of the display*
28   *elements Based on the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claim, the Examiner*
29   *interprets the concept of the claim as equivalent to performing calculations on the*

1   *displayed elements and whitespace, in order to provide an interface that is optimally fit*
2   *for the display legion while maintaining referential integrity. Although Orr does not use*
3   *the express language of the claim such as 'arrayed display elements', Orr does suggest*
4   *the conceptual quest of the claim language when viewed with the broadest reasonable*
5   *interpretation under the specification. For example, based on the fixed properties, the*
6   *image will adjust itself in order to fit in a particular region and will keep its aspect ratio*
7   *and will automatically adjust its height in order to fit the region taking in consideration a*
8   *user specification (col. 43, lines 4-14). Additionally, Orr does expressly disclose content*
9   *scale factors for scaling content either up or down in order to assist in filling all of the*
10   *content into the available media, including a white space scale factor (col. 40, lines 26-.*
11   *46).*

12   In response, the applicants respectfully state that continued exception is taken with the so called

13   equivalency of Orr and the elements in claim 7. A review of the cited portion of Orr has little or

14   no relationship to the claimed invention. Orr has nothing equivalent to arrayed display elements,

15   or the other elements in this claim. Thus claim 7 is allowable over Orr.

16
17   ***Regarding claims 16, 17,18 and 19,*** *Orr teaches A computer program product causing*
18   *a computer to effect the functions of claim ... On discloses processing of data by a*
19   *computer system to automatic formatting of information for a change in design or a*
20   *medium with persistent storage (col. 1, lines 5-9; col. 9, lines 58-65).*

21   In response, the applicants respectfully state that continued exception is taken with the so called

22   equivalency of Orr and the elements in claims 16, 17, 18 and 19. Orr makes no teaching for a

23   "*computer program product causing a computer to effect the functions of* " of any claim. A

24   review of the cited portion of Orr has little or no relationship to the claimed invention. claims 16,

25   17, 18 and 19 are Beauregard type claims not alluded to by Orr and are not made obvious by Orr.

26   Thus claims 16, 17, 18 and 19 are allowable over Orr.

27   The Advisory action states further in conclusion:

28   *For at least all the above evidence, therefore the Examiner respectfully maintains the*
29   *rejection of claims 1-20, and should be sustained.*

30   In response, the applicants respectfully state that the even with just the previous arguments, most

31   of which were not responded to, it was shown that Orr does not make claims 1-20 obvious. This

1   is even more so with Claims 1, 6-8 and 12 further amended to bring this application to allowance

2   quickly.

3   It is anticipated that this amendment brings claims 1-20 to allowance. If any question remains,

4   please contact the undersigned.

5   Please charge any fee necessary for to enter this paper and the RCE to deposit account 50-0510.

6   Respectfully submitted,

7   By: ____/Louis Herzberg/____
8   Dr. Louis P. Herzberg
9   Reg. No. 41,500
10   Voice Tel. (845) 352-3194
11   Fax. (845) 352-3194
12   3 Cloverdale Lane
13   Monsey, NY 10952

14   Customer Number: 54856